



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,690	04/10/2006	Masaichi Hasegawa	TC00001	7227

20462 7590 08/07/2009
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220
P. O. BOX 1539
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939

EXAMINER

BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/07/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

US_cipkop@gsk.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/535,690	Applicant(s) HASEGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner /Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included cancellation of claims 2-4 and amendment to claims 1 and 10, filed on 4/10/2009, is made of record. Claims 1 and 5-11 are now pending. In view of applicants' response, the 112 first paragraph scope of enablement rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-11 as pertaining to physiologically functional derivative has been obviated. However, the following new ground of rejection is applied currently amended claims 1 and 5 as necessitated by applicants' amendment to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating diseases selected from the group consisting of: anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia, does not reasonably provide enablement for diseases selected from the group consisting of: anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia based on the mode of action of the compounds as protein kinase inhibitors as generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant method of use claims 1 and 5 are drawn to a method of treating or

Art Unit: 1624

preventing diseases selected from the group consisting of: anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia, comprising, administering to the human a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of the formula I, or a salt thereof. Instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the inhibition of protein kinases including TrkA, TrkB, TrkC, or Flt-3 by the instant compounds, instant claims reach through not only treating but also preventing anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of protein kinases including TrkA, TrkB, TrkC, or Flt-3, based on limited assay, it is claimed that besides treating, preventing anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia a in general, which there is no enabling disclosure.

“To prevent” actually means to anticipate or counter in advance, to keep from happening etc. (as per Websters II Dictionary) and there is no disclosure as to how one skilled in the art can reasonably establish the basis and the type of subject to which the instant compounds can be administered in order to have the “prevention” effect. There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of

Art Unit: 1624

the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disease(s) or disorder(s) claimed herein. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended mammal. Moreover anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia are very difficult to treat and hardly possible to prevent as claimed herein. The fact that there are number of such drugs available and that they have not been able to prevent contradicts instant invention. Note The instant compounds are disclosed to have receptor protein kinase inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in preventing diseases or disorders stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as protein kinase inhibitor that would be useful for preventing the above said diseases/disorders. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host.

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is “speculative”, “sufficiently unusual” or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed

Art Unit: 1624

invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Mass, R. D., *Int. J. Radiation Oncology Bio. Phys.* Vol. 58(3): 932-940, 2004 and Fabbro et al. *Pharmacology & therapeutics* 93, 79-98, 2002.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in preventing diseases selected from anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia that require receptor protein kinase inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications expressed that the receptor protein kinase inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. See Mass et al. and Fabbro et al., cited above especially the concluding paragraph.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for preventing anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia. Pharmacological activity in general is a very

Art Unit: 1624

unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, “the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved”. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all cancers or abnormal cell growth and the state of the art is that the effects of protein kinase inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The genus of compounds is a huge genus and the species are large and hence the breadth of the claims are too broad.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, “the level of skill in the art” and “predictability”, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds for preventing the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that,

Art Unit: 1624

based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

This rejection is similar to that made in the previous office action but now limited to preventing diseases selected from anemia, aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelosuppression, and cytopenia.

Applicants' traversal is not persuasive as applied to prevention of above mentioned diseases recited in the currently amended claim 1. Hence, for reasons stated above, this rejection is proper.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-11 are allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1624

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Application/Control Number: 10/535,690

Page 9

Art Unit: 1624

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624